

Appln. No. 10/645,464  
Amendment dated July 1, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 1, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 12 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. Claims 13 through 16 have been added.

#### Paragraphs 2 through 9 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 3 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cook.

Claims 4 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Yi.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Hanson.

Claims 1 through 3 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna.

Claims 4 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna, and further in view of Yi.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna, and further in view of Hanson.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "a plurality of roller sets, each roller set having a plurality of rollers" and "wherein the plurality of roller sets are longitudinally separated and spaced from each other".

It is submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Cook, Yi, Hansen, Namiki, and Hegna set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1, especially a plurality of

Appln. No. 10/645,464  
Amendment dated July 1, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 1, 2005

roller sets with each set having a plurality of rollers and the sets being longitudinally separated and spaced from each other".. Further, claims 2 through 12, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Added Claims

Added claim 13 requires "wherein said elongated board has opposite forward and rearward ends, each of said plurality of roller sets having an outermost roller positioned toward one of the opposite forward and rearward ends of the elongated board" and "*a brake member positioned adjacent to each of said outermost rollers* such that pivoting said elongated board on one of said outermost rollers brings one of said brake members into contact with a supporting surface to bring said board to a stop using friction between said brake member and the supporting surface when said board is moving in a forward or a rearward direction". It is submitted that the patents relied upon in the rejections of the Office Action would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed brake members and their positioning.

Added claim 14 requires "wherein said plurality of roller sets comprises two sets, and wherein each of said roller sets includes four rollers". It is also submitted that the cited patents would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed roller sets.

Added claims 15 and 16 include a fairly comprehensive listing of many of the features of the claimed invention, and is similarly submitted to be unobvious in view of the prior art.

Appln. No. 10/645,464  
Amendment dated July 1, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 1, 2005


**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By

  
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931

Date:

July 1, 2005